

## REMARKS

Applicants wish to make the following remarks in response to the Notice of Allowance in the above-referenced patent application. Initially, Applicants note that patent claims are entitled to broad scope, limited only by the limitations of the claims, the specification, and the prior art. See MPEP §2111. The Examiner stated in the Notice of Allowance dated September 15, 2011, that “the limitation ‘cage molecules consisting of carbon atoms’ recited in the claims does not comprise carbon nanotubes” and that “‘fullerene’ was understood by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of filing to be the family of cage molecules consisting of carbon atoms (also called spherical fullerenes)” (p. 4 of Notice of Allowance). Applicants submit that there is no basis in the specification or in the prior art for such limitations. Thus, the allowed claims are entitled to their full scope, limited only by the elements recited in those claims, the specification, and the prior art. Applicants submit that it is improper to read additional limitation into the claims without proper basis.

In addition, the Examiner acknowledges in the Notice of Allowance dated September 15, 2011, that the closest prior art references “do not disclose, teach or suggest isolating or purifying C<sub>60</sub> or C<sub>70</sub> *to any degree* from the sooty carbon product” (p. 3 of Notice of Allowance, emphasis added). However, the Examiner goes much further and also states that “A formed or molded product comprising purified C<sub>60</sub> and/or C<sub>70</sub> as recited in claim 127 does not contain the impurities that are inherently associated with C<sub>60</sub> and/or C<sub>70</sub>” (p. 4 of Notice of Allowance). The specification discloses processes for purifying carbon cage molecules in recoverable amounts such that the proposed uses that are described and claimed may be realized (see, *e.g.*, p. 2, lines 31-33 of the specification). While the Examiner’s statement may be true in certain cases, it is clear from the specification that the word “purified” does not mean that no impurities may

be present at all (see, e.g., pp. 12-14 of the specification). Moreover, the Examiner has agreed that the prior art fails to show “purifying C<sub>60</sub> or C<sub>70</sub> *to any degree* from the sooty carbon product”. Applicants believe that such a statement applies equally to the formed or molded products covered by claim 127.

Applicants believe that the allowed claims are entitled to as much breadth as is consistent with their limitations in view of the specification and prior art. Applicants respectfully submit that it is impermissible to read additional limitations into the claims without sufficient basis for doing so.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16,  
1.17, and 1.21 that may be required by this paper, and to credit any overpayment, to Deposit  
Account No. 50-1283.

Dated: 4/28/04

COOLEY LLP  
ATTN: Patent Group  
777 6<sup>th</sup> Street NW, Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20001

Tel: (202) 728-7833  
Fax: (202) 842-7899

Respectfully submitted,  
**COOLEY LLP**

By:

  
Bonnie Weiss McLeod  
Reg. No. 43,255